

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Criminal Case No. 20-20414

DEMARQUINN RAGLAND,

Honorable Sean F. Cox

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER TO FILE A PROPER MOTION**

The Court received a letter from Defendant, dated May 24, 2023. In the letter, Defendant requests that the Court take certain actions. Such actions can only occur through an order by the Court. Rule 47(a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure requires that “[a] party applying to the court for an order **must do so by motion.**” FED. R. CRIM. P. 47(a) (emphasis added).

In addition, the Court regards the letter, which was not accompanied by a proof of service indicating that it was served on the Government, as an *ex parte* communication. That is, the letter is only from one party “without notice to or argument from the adverse party.” See BLACK’S LAW DICTIONARY, 597 (7<sup>th</sup> ed. 1999). According to Cannon 3(A)(4) of the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, the Court shall not consider the merits of such *ex parte* correspondence.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that, if Defendant wishes to seek relief from the Court, Defendant must file a written motion for such relief. Any such motion must comply with the applicable federal and local court rules and must be served on the Government.

Defendant is further advised that the Court will not review or respond to any additional *ex parte* communications from Defendant, including letters and telephone calls.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 13, 2023

s/Sean F. Cox  
Sean F. Cox  
U. S. District Judge